

REMARKS

With the entry of the foregoing amendments, the application contains claims 1-14. Favorable consideration is requested.

Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to place the claim in more conventional U.S. patent claim format and as discussed in the telephone interview with the Examiner on May 4, 2009. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, e.g., page 3, lines 12 and 21, page 4, lines 25-34, Figures 5-6, etc. No new matter has been added by the claim amendments.

As noted during the interview, the claimed invention results in objects with superior barrier properties.

In this regard, amended claim 1 requires:

A multilayer dose having a surface, the dose comprising
a first synthetic resin and
at least one layer of a different functional resin imprisoned at least largely
in said first synthetic resin,
wherein, prior to any compression molding, a part of the dose's surface
is concave, and
wherein the multilayer dose is in the melt state and has an axis of
symmetry for the realization of multilayer objects by compression.

The cited prior art, either individually or in any reasonably apparent combination, does not anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention. See also the previously filed Rule 132 Declaration that supplies facts that further distinguishes the claimed

THOMASSET
U.S. App. 10591126

invention from the prior art. In this regard, the claimed multilayer dose that is in the melt state is structurally different than a molded part like a parison that is solid or any perform disclosed in Kudert. Thus, Kudert's disclosure does not anticipate the multilayer dose of claim 1 or any claim depending thereon. Also, for the reasons and facts set forth in the Rule 132 Declaration, Kudert does not render obvious any dependent claims.

Nor does the Van Schaftingen reference render obvious claims 13-14. As set forth in detail in paragraphs 9-10 of the previously filed Rule 132 Declaration, Van Schaftingen fails to disclose or suggest the specific process of claim 13 and the specific product of claim 14. Indeed, the cited reference does not include any drawings and discloses entirely different devices and processes. In view of the facts and positions set forth in the Rule 132 Declaration, applicant requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13 and 14 based on Van Schaftingen.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions or believes that minor claim amendments would assist with the allowance of this case, the undersigned may be contacted at 703-816-4009.

THOMASSET
U.S. App. 10591126

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Duane M. Byers/ 

Duane M. Byers

Reg. No. 33,363

DMB:Imo

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100